

Remarks

The outstanding office action addresses claims 1-12, claims 13-17 being withdrawn from consideration as relating to a non-elected subject matter. The examined claims are all rejected as being anticipated and/or obvious in light of U.S. Patent No. 2,158,362. The office action further objects to the drawings, Figures 13-14, in that the subject matter of claim 4 as indicated by the Examiner is not specifically shown in the drawings.

In order to address the drawing issue, the objected to language relating to the “point near a point where the radius of curvature of the bowl changes from a smaller value to a larger value” has been deleted in each instance. Therefore, the objection to the drawings is believed to be satisfied.

Addressing the anticipation rejection, it is respectfully submitted that the Groeniger ‘362 patent does not anticipate independent claim 1 or any of the claims which depend therefrom. Attached is Exhibit A which is a side by side comparison of Figure 14 of the present application with Figure 2 of the Groeniger ‘362 patent. The toilet of the present application has a rim 6 at the upper edge of the bowl opening which has an overhanging surface 6a which immediately overlies a shelf 6c which extends about the circumference of the bowl immediately below the overhanging shelf surface. The Groeniger patent discloses no comparable shelf surface formed on the waste receiving surface. The structure referred to by the Examiner as defining the shelf at 28 is an internal structure within the rim and not on the rim inner surface which overhangs inwardly above a shelf formed between the rim and the waste receiving surface of the bowl. Additionally, the first and second order spouting section limitations for spouting cleansing water onto the shelf of the bowl to form a vortex is not found in the ‘362 reference. The Examiner references on channels 32a and 32b which provide water to the drainage channel as opposed to providing water to the shelf surrounding the rim of the bowl.

Since the shelf and the first and second water spouting sections are not present in the '362 reference, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and all the remaining dependent claims are not anticipated by Groeniger. As for the limitations of claims 6-7, 9 and 12, it is respectfully submitted that those limitations are not obvious in light of Groeniger since Groeniger lacks a shelf, therefore, the angle of the shelf or the capacity of water fed to the shelf cannot be considered obvious.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application in its amended form, is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any remaining concerns regarding the distinction in claim 1 over the '362 reference, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that these concerns can be addressed and potentially rectified by Examiner's amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenichi Nakamura

By /John E. Nemazi/

John E. Nemazi

Reg. No. 30,876

Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: September 19, 2007

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351